

## Addendum to the IRWM Implementation Grant Round 1 August 2010 PSP

**Background:** On October 19, 2010, Senate Bill (SB) 855 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review Resources, Chptr 718, Stats 2010) was passed into law. This bill affected the IRWM implementation round 1 grant solicitation in two ways:

- 1) It appropriated additional Proposition 84 funding that can be available in round 1 and
- 2) It contains a provision that requires additional information from applicants.

This addendum contains those portions of the PSP that are modified due to enactment of SB 855. These additions do not impact how applications will be scored, but they can limit DWR's ability to award SB 855 appropriated funding to an application. All other provisions of the PSP remain unchanged and are still applicable to grant applications. The blue text below shows additions to the PSP and the red-strikeout text shows deletions.

**Page 6, Section II B. Eligibility Criteria** – The following paragraph is added:

SB 855 was signed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger on October 19, 2010. In addition to other actions, SB 855 made appropriation with specific funding requirements. For funds appropriated pursuant to SB 855, in addition to other eligibility requirements, in areas that receive water supplied from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, eligible programs and projects (CWC Section 75026.(a)(1-11)) shall be components of an IRWM Plan that will help reduce dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply.

**Page 9, Section III. Funding** - The paragraph is modified as follows:

DWR is proposing multiple rounds of funding for Proposition 84 IRWM Implementation grants. The first round is expected to provide approximately \$100 million in funding from the Regional Funds, as authorized by Proposition 84 and California Water Code (CWC) Section 83002.(b)(3)(A)(i). Additional funding, approximately \$100 million, as appropriated by SB 855, may also be awarded, ~~if it becomes available~~. Award of ~~any the~~ additional funding will be consistent with any requirements associated with the specific appropriation of funds. See Section II.B of the Guidelines for additional detail.

DWR has funding targets, shown below, to guide the distribution of a portion of the funds.

- ✎ Not less than \$20,000,000 will be allocated to support urban and agricultural water conservation projects necessary to meet a 20% reduction in per capita water use by the year 2020.
- ✎ Not less than 10% of the available funding will be used to support projects that address critical water supply or water quality needs for DACs, where feasible and as applicable, to be awarded consistent with the Funding Area allocation schedule in Proposition 84 (See Guidelines, Figure 1).

If a project meets multiple funding targets, the funds awarded the project will be counted towards both funding targets. If DWR does not receive projects applicable to a funding target or such projects do not demonstrate sufficient technical feasibility or anticipated project benefits, DWR will reserve (not award) the amount of grant funding specified in that funding target.

**Page 9 and 10, Section III A Maximum Grant Amount** – text has been modified as follows:

DWR may alter the anticipated allocation schedule depending on the total amount of grant request received, the grant requests received by individual funding area, and whether the submitted proposals demonstrate sufficient technical feasibility or anticipated project benefits. The Column C amount should be viewed as the default maximum grant amount for an individual region. However, Should this occur, Column D shows the proposed maximum redistribution of funds by funding area. Therefore, an applicant may request up to the Column D amount because additional funding (over the originally anticipated \$100,000,000) is now available, but the proposal should be phased in anticipation of receiving either the Column C amount, plus possibly only a portion of funds available in excess of Column C targets. Additionally, for those funding areas with multiple IRWM Regions, DWR will also consider funding more than one proposal. Therefore, a proposal should also be phased in anticipation of receiving less than the Column C amount. DWR will not exceed the allocation

schedule included in Proposition 84 and presented in Guidelines, Figure 1. In compliance with AB 626, DWR will make every effort to allocate, [as applicable](#), 10% of each region's funding to support projects that address critical water supply or water quality needs of DACs.

Table 2 – Proposition 84 IRWM Implementation Funding			
Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D
Funding Area	Prop 84 Schedule	Anticipated Allocation Schedule for This Grant Cycle <a href="#">Default Maximum Grant Amount</a>	Maximum First Round Allocation  <a href="#">Alternative Maximum Grant Amount</a>
North Coast	\$37,000,000	\$4,111,111	\$8,222,222
San Francisco Bay	\$138,000,000	\$15,333,333	\$30,666,667
Central Coast	\$52,000,000	\$5,777,778	\$11,555,556
Los Angeles-Ventura	\$215,000,000	\$23,888,889	\$47,777,778
Santa Ana	\$114,000,000	\$12,666,667	\$25,333,333
San Diego	\$91,000,000	\$10,111,111	\$20,222,222
Sacramento River	\$73,000,000	\$8,111,111	\$16,222,222
San Joaquin River	\$57,000,000	\$6,333,333	\$12,666,667
Tulare/Kern (Tulare Lake)	\$60,000,000	\$6,666,667	\$13,333,333
Lahontan	\$27,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$6,000,000
Colorado River Basin	\$36,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$8,000,000
Total	\$900,000,000	Less than or equal to \$100,000,000	<a href="#">Approximately \$200,000,000</a>

**Page 15, Section V B 1. Grant Application Checklist (Table 4), APPLICANT INFORMATION AND QUESTIONS TAB** – Q15, Q16, and Q17 are added as follows:

Q15. Eligibility: Does the IRWM region receive water supplied from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta? Please answer yes or no. If no, please explain. If yes, please answer Question 16.

Q16. Eligibility: Does the existing IRWM Plan help reduce dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply? Please answer yes or no. If no, please explain. If yes, please complete Attachment 15.

Q17. Eligibility: If an update to the plan takes place in the near future, will the updated plan continue to reduce dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply? Please answer yes or no. If no, please explain. If yes, please complete Attachment 15.

**Page 17, Section V B 1. Grant Application Checklist (Table 4), APPLICATION ATTACHMENTS TAB** – Attachment 15 is added as follows:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Attachment 15	IRWM Plan – Reduce Delta Water Dependence	
--------------------------	---------------	---	--

**ATTACHMENT 15. IRWM Plan – Reduce Delta Water Dependence**

For the “AttachmentName” in the naming convention of BMS, use “Deltawater” for this attachment.

This attachment is only necessary if the IRWM region receives water supplied from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and answered “yes” to Q16 and/or Q17. Attachment 15 must summarize the portions of the plan that addresses how implementation of the IRWM Plan will reduce dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply, and include relevant plan excerpts to support the summary.

The summary text must be no more than 5 pages in length using a minimum 10-point type font. Excerpts from the plan must not exceed 15 pages. Attachment 15 must:

- 1) Identify and include portions of the IRWM Plan that demonstrate it reduces dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply. This can be but is not limited to plan objectives and an explanation of how the types of projects that help meet that objective reduce dependence on the delta for water supply.
- 2) Provide assurances that revisions to the plan, as required by DWR pursuant to a grant agreement for funding awarded during this solicitation, will continue to help reduce dependence on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water supply. This can be but is not limited to an explanation of how the objective(s) identified in item 1 above, will remain intact in the revision.